



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,405	03/19/2001	Kenneth H. Crain	108292.00008	3389

7590 07/27/2005

Steven W. Thrasher  
Jackson Walker, LLP  
2435 North Central Expressway, #600  
Richardson, TX 75080

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,405

Applicant(s)

CRAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 5/2/05.

This action is made **FINAL**.

Claims 1-15, and 18-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, and 21 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 8/12/04, claims 1, 13 and 21 were amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 1, it recites "...a change in the visual stimuli without requiring user specified information as input..."; the "user specified information" is a new subject that is not disclosed in the specification.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1 – 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rapaport et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,890,152.

As per claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches a system that enables a recording of user-viewable stimuli comprising:

A processing platform for executing code capable of recording a user-viewable visual stimuli; (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 34 – 40; the examiner interprets user-viewable stimuli to be any data viewable by the user);

verifying a change in the visual stimuli (see Rapaport, column 12, lines 33 – 37; the examiner interprets determining whether a scroll bar is depressed as verifying a change in visual stimuli) without requiring user specified information as an input (column 11 ,lines 58-column 12, line 11; How long the user is looking at the section of the media file segment is a visual stimuli that does not require user specified information as input); and

creating a visual event related to the change in the visual stimuli (see Rapaport, column 12, lines 37 – 40; the examiner interprets changing the activation value of the profile relating to the media file as creating a visual event relating to the change in visual stimuli); and

A storage platform for storing at least the user-viewed visual stimuli, wherein the storage platform is operably coupled to the processing platform (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 32 - 34).

Wherein the processing platform is adopted to reconstruct at least one of:

Art Unit: 2174

The visual stimuli (col. 23, lines 62-68); and

The change in the visual stimuli, at a specific time that a user viewed the visual stimuli.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system comprising a user interaction device coupled to the processing platform (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 31 – 32).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Microsoft corp. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Microsoft corp. further teaches the system wherein the processing platform executes code capable of recording a user-viewable stimuli, by:

detecting a visual event;

verifying that the visual event involves a parameter that changes a viewable stimuli; and

recording at least one parameter (see Rapaport et al., column 12, lines 26 – 40; the user's progression through the media file segment is interpreted as the visual event, the rate of this progression is detected, analyzed and if there is a change the activation value parameter is changed and stored).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system comprising a browser coupled to the processing platform (see Rapaport et al., column 2, line 33).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system comprising a browser interface coupled to a processing platform (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 29 - 40; the device described can be interpreted to be a processing platform).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system comprising a network coupled to the processing platform (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 26 - 28).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system wherein the storage platform comprises cached memory (see Rapaport et al., column 5, lines 17 - 21 and figure 1, item 106; it is inferred that random access memory is used as cached memory).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches where the system is maintained in a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) (see Rapaport et al., column 5, lines 22 - 26; the examiner interprets a "web-enabled telephone" as a personal digital assistant).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 6 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system wherein the network is the internet (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 26 - 28).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Rapaport et al. teaches the system of claim 6 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches the system comprising a host computer coupled to the network, the host computer for communicating with the processing platform (see Rapaport et al. column 6, lines 1 – 4; by accessing a search engine via a computer network, it can be inferred that the processing platform is communicating with a search engine host computer).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches an eye-tracking device coupled to the processing platform (see Rapaport et al. column 3, lines 1 – 3).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Rapaport et al. teaches the method of claim 11 (see rejection above). Rapaport et al. further teaches that the eye-tracking device is enabled to monitor pupil dilation (see Rapaport et al., column 25, lines 32 – 35).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport teaches the system of claim 1 (see rejection above). Rapaport further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the change is caused by a user (see Rapaport et al., column 2, lines 34 – 40).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 – 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochmuth, U.S. Patent No. 6,046,741 in view of Rapaport et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,890,152.

As per claim 13, Hochmuth teaches a system that enables a recording of user-viewable visual stimuli comprising:

a processing platform for:

executing code capable of recording a user-viewable visual stimuli (see

Hochmuth, column 2, lines 46 – 51; the examiner interprets graphical elements displayed on a screen as user-viewable visual stimuli);

verifying a change in the visual stimuli (see Hochmuth, column 2, line 63 – column 3, line 6; the examiner interprets a command executed through the graphical user interface as a change in the visual stimuli);

creating a visual event related to the change in the visual stimuli (see Hochmuth, column 1, lines 51 – 57 and column 3, lines 43 – 48; the examiner interprets a logged event as a visual event); and



Art Unit: 2174

a storage platform for storing at least the user-viewed visual stimuli, the storage platform coupled to the processing platform (see Hochmuth, column 2, lines 46 – 51).

Hochmuth does not teach verifying a change in a user's eye position and creating a visual event related to the change in the user's eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli.

And wherein the processing platform is adopted to reconstruct at least one of:

The change in the visual stimuli, in association with the change in the user's eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli, at a specific time that a user view ed the visual stimuli at a specific time that a user viewed the visual stimuli.

Rapaport teaches verifying a change in a user's eye position (see Rapaport, column 25, lines 30 – 35) and creating a visual event related to the change in the user's eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli (see Rapaport, column 12, lines 55-58; The coordinates of eye gaze position is the user's eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli column 25, lines 32 – 35; the examiner interprets changing a rate of progression value as creating a visual event).

And wherein the processing platform is adopted to reconstruct:

The change in the visual stimuli, in association with the change in the user's eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli, at a specific time that a user view ed the visual stimuli at a specific time that a user viewed the visual stimuli. (see Rapaport, column 12, lines 55-58; It is inherent that coordinates is measured at a specific time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Rapaport with the system of Hochmuth in order to provide an improved system of analyzing user interest in displayed information.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Hochmuth and Rapaport teach the data signal of claim 13 (see rejection above). Hochmuth does not teach the system of claim 13 further comprising a parameter related to the visual event, wherein the parameter is a network address of all online content immediately displayed within a browser window. Rapaport teaches a parameter related to a visual event, wherein the parameter is a network address of all online content immediately displayed within a browser window (see Rapaport et al., column 9, lines 49 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Rapaport with the system of Hochmuth in order to create shortcuts to online documents.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, Hochmuth and Rapaport teach the system of claim 13 (see rejection above). Hochmuth does not teach the system of claim 13 further comprising a parameter related to the visual event, wherein the parameter is a two-dimensional offset of the online content as it is displayed within a browser window. Rapaport teaches parameter related to the visual event, wherein the parameter is a two-dimensional offset of the online content as it is displayed within a browser window (see Rapaport, column 25, lines 25 – 29; it can be inferred that if the number of scrolled pages per minute are calculated, the two-dimensional offset for each page of the content must be calculated and stored). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the

Art Unit: 2174

method of Rapaport with the system of Hochmuth in order to provide an improved system of analyzing user interest in displayed information.

As per claim 21, it is of similar scope to claim 13 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rapaport et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,890,152 in view of Hochmuth, U.S. Patent No. 6,046,741.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport teaches the system of claim 1. Rapaport does not teach the system of claim 1 wherein the change is caused by a source of the visual stimuli. Hochmuth teaches wherein a change in visual stimuli is caused by a source of the visual stimuli (see Hochmuth, column 2, lines 46 – 51 and column 4, lines 15 – 30; the examiner interprets the computer as a source of the visual stimuli and displaying a dialog box to a user upon an automatic detection of a repeating sequence as creating a visual stimuli). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the system of Hochmuth with the system of Rapaport in order to automatically alert a user to a system state.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 1, Rapaport teaches the system of claim 1. Rapaport does not teach the system of claim 1, wherein the change is caused by the processing platform. Hochmuth teaches wherein a change is caused by the processing platform (see

Art Unit: 2174

Hochmuth, column 2, lines 46 – 51 and column 4, lines 15 – 30; the examiner interprets the computer as a processing platform and displaying a dialog box to a user upon an automatic detection of a repeating sequence as creating a visual stimuli). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the system of Hochmuth with the system of Rapaport in order to automatically alert a user to a system state.

*Response to Argument*

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments focused on the following:

A) Rapaport fails to teach changing the visual stimuli "without requiring user specified information as an input."

B) Rapaport fails to teach reconstructing "the change in visual stimuli in association with the change in eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli."

Examiner disagrees:

A) The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Rapaport teaches changing the visual stimuli “without requiring user specified information as an input” because Rapaport changes the visual stimuli based on the user’s profile (column 2, lines 35-40); user profile is modified by how long the user looked at a section of a media file segment (column 11, lines 58-column 12, lines 11); and how long user looked at a section of a media file is not a user specified input information.

B) Rapaport teaches reconstructing “the change in visual stimuli in association with the change in eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli.” Application defines eye position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli to be the position of which the user’s eye is looking at (Page 13, lines 25 of the Specification). Rapaport changes the visual stimuli, the rate of media progression, based on the coordinates of which user’s eye<sup>s</sup> are gazing at. (column 12, lines 51-57) Therefore, Rapaport teaches this limitation because the coordinates of which user’s eyes are gazing at is the same as the position with respect to a portion of the visual stimuli. ↵↵

Art Unit: 2174

*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

*Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke